REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the following prior art rejections:

1. Claims 6-8, 10, 12, 13, 22, 25, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by (lacking novelty over) Mani '683.

2. Claims 16, 19-21 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by (lacking novelty over) Kwon (KR '700).

3. Claims 1-5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Mani '683 in view of Kwon.

4. Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Mani '683 in view of Mani '763.

5. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Kwon in view of Mani '683.

6. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Mani '683 in view of Faccin '668.

7. Claims 11 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are patentable (obvious) over Mani '683 in view of Chen '791.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

According to the dictionary, the word “hook up” means “connection between two places, systems, or pieces of equipment”. Thus, "hook up between terminals" means that communication is possible by generation of a bidirectional communication channel. Thus, and

since the Examiner has properly interpreted the term "hook-up", Applicant respectfully submits that the language of claims 5, 10, 20 and 27 is, in fact, **not** indefinite, whereby Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; however, if the Examiner still feels that the involved language needs clarification, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss the matter.

Rejections 1 and 2, based on anticipation, require that Mani '683 or Kwon (KR '700), disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of each of the rejected claims, or in other words, that each of the rejected claims be readable on the disclosure of either Mani '683 or Kwon. Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case here.

Each of these rejected claims has been amended to make it clear that the multimedia data stored in the receiving phone is transmitted, in response to the "call signal" and "regardless of the state" of the receiving mobile phone, via a separate channel to the sending mobile phone.

Since these and other limitations are not disclosed, or even suggested, in Mani '683 or Kwon, Applicant respectfully submits that these references are **incapable of anticipating** the rejected claims. Furthermore, Mani '683 merely discloses a call party profile presentation system for delivering a party's calling presentation profile to a subscriber at call set-up or during the call in order to uniquely identify the caller. Kwon is cited in Applicant's IDS and cited and distinguished in Applicant's specification in paragraph [06], where Kwon's disclosure is explained as "the multimedia mailbox is operated only when the recipient is in the state where a

call cannot be received, such as a case where the recipient does not receive the call or the recipient's line is busy".

Rejections 3-7 rely on unpatentability (obviousness) using either Mani '683 or Kwon as a primary reference. In view of the above-described deficiencies in the disclosures of these two references, Applicant respectfully submits that the combinations of references used in rejections 3-7 are flawed and these rejections should be withdrawn since these two references are deficient in that they do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations of the rejected claims. The combinations of Mani '683 and Kwon (rejections 3 and 5) are clearly untenable in view of the above-described deficiencies in these references.

Furthermore, with respect to rejections 4, 6 and 7, Mari '763, Faccin '668 and Chen '791, applied as secondary references, do not compensate the deficiencies of Mani '683.

Thus, since the combined disclosures of the references cited in rejections 3-7 do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the limitations of these rejected claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these references are incapable of rendering obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the subject matter of each of these claims, whereby Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the five (5) rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In summary, the invention defined in the pending claims 1-32 relates to a method of, regardless of voice communication, allowing the receiver's part to transmit the multimedia data to the caller's part mobile phone through an additional channel from the moment when the sending part transmits a "call signal" to the receiver's mobile phone.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the prior art may broadly suggest having the receiver's part transmit predetermined data other than voice communication, the present (novel and non-obvious) invention has the feature of transmitting the multimedia data (stored in a memory), optionally selected by the receiver's part, to the caller's part, regardless of whether the hook-up was performed by the receiver's part (that is, regardless of whether the voice communication channel was connected by pushing a certain button).

However, such a feature cannot be deduced from the combination of Mani '683 and Kwon with or without Mani '763, Faccin '668 or Chen '791. That is, Applicant's claimed invention provides for automatically downloading multimedia data, from a receiver's part mobile phone, by only making a phone call to the receiver's part mobile phone which stores the multimedia data therein.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees

under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/
John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 9, 2006